DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 242 452 RC 014 663

AUTHOR	Jones, Earl
TITLE	ESEA Title VII Bilingual Education Program, East Texas State University. Annual External Evaluation Report and Provisional Followup Survey, 1982-1983.
INSTITUTION	Development Associates, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Sep 83
GRANT	605248
NOTE	56p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Development Associates, 693 Sutter St., 3rd Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102 ($5.85).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Role; Agency Cooperation; *Bilingual Education; *Bilingual Teachers; Educational Finance; *English (Second Language); Evaluation Methods; Faculty Evaluation; Formative Evaluation; Graduate Surveys; Higher Education; Limited English Speaking; *Mexican American Education; Program Administration; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Program Improvement; School Community Relationship; Staff Development; Summative Evaluation; *Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS	Dallas Independent School District TX; *East Texas State University; Elementary Secondary Education Act Title VII

ABSTRACT

During 1982-83, the bilingual studies program at East Texas State University (ETSU) continued to improve at all levels, but especially at the undergraduate level in its attempt to produce highly qualified bilingual and English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers and specialists. Funded by ETSU, the U.S. Department of Education, and the Texas Education Agency, the 7-year-old project began in cooperation with the Dallas Independent School District but expanded to other schools. During the year, the program cooperated closely with other universities, educational service centers, the Texas Education Agency, and other ETSU departments. Both observers and students rated degree and endorsement/certificate plans and instruction highly. Graduate courses and courses in Spanish and methods received the highest ratings. Some undergraduate courses caused problems but only six received low ratings. Overall, the program showed improvements in instruction and degree design. Preliminary results of a survey of former students indicated they felt the program was strong, especially the Spanish, methods, ESL, and social studies courses. Their negative remarks were consistent with current student opinion. Appendices include the revised program of study, evaluation forms, and the survey. (SB)

ED242452

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNMENTAL CONSULTANTS

693 SUTTER STREET, THIRD FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-1077
415/776-0120

ANNUAL EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT
and
PROVISIONAL FOLLOWUP SURVEY
1982-1983 ESEA TITLE VII
BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

EAST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Earl Jones

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Dr. Earl Jones

September 1983

RC014663

ARLINGTON - 2924 COLUMBIA PIKE, ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22204-4399 Cable Address: DAWASH 703/979-0100
DENVER - 1649 DOWNING STREET, DENVER, COLORADO 80218 303/831-0303
PHILADELPHIA - 1423A ROLLING GLEN DRIVE, BOOTHWYN, PENNSYLVANIA 19061 215/485-7959
WASHINGTON, D.C. - P.O. BOX 28058, 1756 COLUMBIA ROAD, NW, 2ND FLOOR, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009 202/387-2090

COLOMBIA - APARTADO AEREO 90260, BOGOTA, COLOMBIA, SOUTH AMERICA 256-8604
EL SALVADOR - APARTADO POSTAL 01-286, SAN SALVADOR, EL SALVADOR, CENTRAL AMERICA 503/22-5723
PHILIPPINES - 161 ROXAS BLVD., #304, BACLARAN, METRO MANILA, PHILIPPINES 011/63-2-828-73-46

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The external evaluation of the East Texas State University ESEA Title VII Bilingual Education Program necessarily entailed the collection of a great many data. Many University professors and administrators, teachers and administrators from the participating school districts, and the participants in the program provided information and statistical data. While the number of those assisting is too large to name them all, their help is sincerely appreciated.

Much of the burden of coordinating the collection of data and arranging for the monitoring of the work was borne by:

Dr. Alonzo Sosa, Bilingual Studies Coordinator.

His efforts on behalf of the study are deeply appreciated. The facilitation of the interviews and other data collection made the study possible.

In addition, much of the detail work on the student followup survey was conducted by Mrs. Olga Perez; her persistence and efforts are appreciated.

The Bilingual Education Advisory Committee, an important facet of the management of the program, was generous in giving of time and information to help facilitate the evaluation. Special thanks go to the members of that committee.

* * * * * * *

This report was prepared under contract with East Texas State University through ESEA Title VII funding, Grant 605248, from the US Department of Education. Officials of East Texas State University and the participating districts assisted by providing or facilitating information. The data reported, however, and the conclusions drawn, do not necessarily represent the official positions of the districts, the University, or the US Department of Education. No official endorsement of them should be inferred.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS i

THE EAST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY PROGRAM 1

Program Objectives 2
Program Processes 3
Sites for Instruction 4

APPROACHES TO THE EVALUATION 6

Internal Evaluation 6
External Evaluation 8
Monitoring 9
Project Documentation 9
The Student Perceptions Study 9
Limitations to the Evaluation 11

PROGRAM PROCESSES 13

Administration 14
Inter-Agency Cooperation 15
Institutionalization 16
Teaching Faculty 17
Professionalization 19
Community Involvement 20
Communications 21
Resource Facilities 22
Summary of the Process Variables 22

THE STUDENTS IN THE PROGRAM 24

Program Participants 24

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF THE SERVICES 28

General Perceptions 28

PERCEPTIONS OF THE INSTRUCTION 31

Course Ratings 34

THE FOLLOWUP SURVEY 36

Characteristics of the Survey Students 37
Course Grouping Judgments 38
Program Judgments 39

REPORT SUMMARY 41

Summary of the 1982-1983 Evaluation 41
Summary of the Followup Survey 42

APPENDICES 45

A: Revised Program of Studies 46
B: Annual Evaluation Form 49
C: Followup Survey Form 51

LIST OF TABLES

1: Comparative Frequencies of Reporting Participants by Occupation from 1976 to 1983. 25

2: Comparative Frequencies of the Total and Bilingual Teaching Experience of the Participants: 1979-1983. 26

3: Male and Female Proportions among the Student Populations: 1979-1983 . . 26

4: Reported Ethnicity Frequencies: 1979-1983. 26

5: Rating Frequencies and Calculated Composite Means on Degree Design . . . 29

6: Frequencies and Composite Ratings of the Liaison Services: 1979-1983 . . . 30

7: Comparative Overall Ratings by Students of the Courses Taken to Fulfill their Degree Requirements: 1981-1982 and 1982-1983. 34

8: Occupations of the Responding Survey Students as of Summer 1983 37

9: Mean Ratings of the Survey Respondents on the Program Course Groupings. . 38

FIGURE

Schematum of the Project Evaluation Design. 7

THE EAST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY PROGRAM

East Texas State University, in conjunction with the Dallas Independent School District and others in the North Texas area, and with funds from the US Department of Education and some especially designated monies from the Texas Education Agency, plus budgeted items from the University itself, established a bilingual studies program seven years ago and has operated it since that time. The primary purpose of this training program is to assist the State through the provision of well prepared teachers, administrators, and specialists to upgrade the teaching of Texas' bilingual students.

During the past several years, enormous gains have been registered in the provision of services to limited and non-English speaking pupils. Some students still do not receive the necessary services, however, because the shortage of qualified teachers still persists. Indeed, the statistics on the latter problem, an insufficienct number of teachers, have not changed in recent years due in part to the increases in the number of youngsters needing bilingual education and in part to the number of teachers that have left the profession each year or who take jobs in other states.

The State of Texas has a high proportion of Mexican Americans, other Spanish speaking populations, Native Americans, and recently, speakers of other languages, notably Vietnamese. Too, the emphasis on teaching English as a Second Language, both as a separate subject and in conjunction with bilingual education, increased the training needs for the North Texas area. The original anticipation, then, of a relatively short term training effort, was not borne out. While the number of Mexican Americans enrolled in universities has risen dramatically in Texas, the number training to be bilingual education teachers leveled off before the needs were met. Nearly no Vietnamese speakers are enrolled in teacher training programs in the State and few from other language groups expect to enter the field.

Several factors have contributed to the slow growth in the number of Spanish speaking teachers. Although most Mexican Americans are fluent in oral/aural Spanish, few of the older teachers and only recently some of the younger people, have had the opportunity to become fully literate in that language. Many high schools and most universities offered Spanish courses but since their thrust was conversation, few Mexican Americans enrolled. This lack reduced the pool of potential teachers from that group. Furthermore, as with all groups, only a limited number want to be teachers - they enroll in many different academic programs. Too, even those who choose education as a career, do not necessarily want to teach in elementary schools nor in bilingual education; many prefer to teach mathematics, science, and the other fields. As with speakers of any other language, individual inclinations vary widely.

Additionally, the salaries of teachers in Texas have not kept pace with those in many other fields and education's drawing power among Mexican Americans has decreased. Higher salaries elsewhere drain Texas resources. And, finally, there is a substantial proportion

of Mexican Americans that has not subscribed to bilingual education as a way to improve the education of their children. That, also, reduces the potential for Spanish/English bilingual education as a chosen teaching field.

The East Texas State University ESEA Title VII Bilingual Education Program is a vital part of the necessary mobilization to meet the challenge. By providing not only the subject matter and education courses required, but additionally offering a strong program in the Spanish language, the University helps those already literate in the language, those who need only certain portions of it, or those who want to become fluent and literate. Further, with the population of Spanish speakers growing in the northern portion of the state, and with the economic status of many of them still low in comparison to some other groups, the tuition assistance part of the program has not diminished in importance. While Texas teacher salaries may not be very high, that field still serves as one avenue for upward mobility while at the same time providing teachers who can be trained for bilingual education duties and who, at the same time, understand the needs of the youngsters they serve. The earlier federal aim of furnishing seed monies for the establishment of university programs was commendable and has produced important results. The additional benefit, helping supply the training of bilingual teachers while at the same time assisting low income Mexican Americans and others to enter the education field, should not yet be abandoned. The need is still great. The continuing participation of the federal and state governments, the school districts, and the University is vital to improvements in education.

Program Objectives

The program at East Texas State University was designed to increase the effectiveness of teachers and administrators in meeting the needs of limited and non-English speaking pupils in the state, and especially in the northern part of the state. The programs at all three levels - undergraduate, masters, and doctorate - first offer a strong preparatory program in the several kinds of subject matter to be taught, in the methods for general education, in the specific methods for bilingual education, and in linguistics and the Spanish language. That is, the University is concerned that the participants, for example, know mathematics and how to teach mathematics in both English and Spanish. Bilingual and multicultural skills in counseling, administration, and other specializations are included. Expertise in working with parents and other community members of different cultures is an important part of the program.

Further, the program was designed to help educational personnel meet the educational needs and other life skills of all children, to develop the special expertise to provide equal opportunity of access to children of limited and non-English speaking proficiency, and to help improve their performance within the educational, social, and economic systems once they have gained entry. As a part of their education, the participants also experience bilingual education as they pursue their undergraduate and graduate degrees, thus increasing

their awareness of the strengths and weaknesses, the promises and problems, of learning in two languages. The courses, the bilingual environment, the utilization of the teachers' classroom experiences in the program, and frequent meetings and other developmental work with professionals in education and members of the communities, were expected to help create a climate conducive to reaching the goals of this program.

The program objectives were stated in behavioral terms, that is, the program was designed as competency based, to help the students acquire the knowledge and skills needed in:

- English and Spanish
- Mexican American and other cultures
- Bilingual teaching methodologies
- Measurement of student progress
- Research methodology

Special objectives related to counseling, administration, and other school functions were also stated. In brief, the objectives spoke to the acquisition, improvement, and knowledge of languages and how to impart them and subject matter to children; to add knowledge of the socioeconomic and cultural realities of the US cultures, especially Mexican American, and how these can affect children's learning; to increase teachers' and other personnel's knowledge and supplement their knowledge and skills in research so they can profit more from publications and might, themselves, contribute to the body of knowledge about Mexican Americans and bilingual education through research.*

Program Processes

East Texas State University incorporated a wide variety of academic resources into the program, utilizing the knowledge and expertise of many disciplines. English, Spanish, linguistics, history, sociology, anthropology, psychology, elementary education, and administration were the sources of input. This necessitated the cooperation of three colleges and several departments within the university, as well as the graduate division. The degree design and the course syllabi were carefully prepared with the advice of the bilingual education personnel of the Texas Education Agency, the Dallas Independent School District and others nearby, and representatives of the potential students, as well as of the communities they were to serve. Further modifications have been made as each successive year's experiences were evaluated. New courses have been added as the need arose and others have been modified. (See the 1976-1977 through 1981-1982 reports for the sequence of the changes.)

Many courses have been offered at the school sites from which the participants came, helping to increase the reality based nature of the program. Field experiences were also provided for students not currently teaching in bilingual education. Resource persons from the Mexican American community, both general citizens and a number

---

* *See original application to the US Office of Education and the continuation proposals to the US Department of Education.*

of professionals, were brought into the planning process. East Texas State University staff members with skills and experience in related fields were utilized. Staff vacancies were often filled with qualified Latin Americans and others who spoke Spanish and/or have had experience in bilingual education; these, too, were added to the consulting pool for the implementation of the program. The library has carried out a continual acquisition process of the needed materials for the research and course work.

An essential ingredient in the plan was the participation of the bilingual teachers in the presentations in the classes, whether brought in as special resources or included as participants in the degree or certificate programs. The knowledge and skills they had gained, the materials they were using, and their general experiences added a substantial dimension of practicality to the training efforts. This was especially important for the methods and materials courses offered by elementary education. Further, it was expected that the requirements of the courses, the materials they would develop in education, language, and culture classes, as well as materials they would discover via the program generally, would add importantly to the conduct of bilingual and multicultural education in the schools.

Just as important, too, was the use of the Spanish language in the courses by both the professionals and the students. While there were some limitations to the oral/aural capabilities with Spanish in both groups, each would be expected to strive for a continual increase in the amount of Spanish in the lectures, discussions, and written work in order to provide some of the bilingual environment and furnish opportunities for the acquisition of a professional grasp of the language. The University chose professors with the greatest command of Spanish while at the same time being specialists in their fields.

Liaison services were also included in the process. Faculty with appointments that allowed monitoring of classes in which bilingual education was being conducted, assisting school staffs, and consulting with the student participants, were chosen as the primary personnel for this assignment. Additionally, the liaison personnel gathered information from the schools which was then fed back into the program, thereby aiding the University in keeping itself current and effective.

Sites for Instruction

In keeping with its philosophy of taking the education to the most appropriate setting, several instructional areas have been utilized. The campus of East Texas State University, with its library holdings and professionals available, hosts a substantial number of courses. Similarly, the University Satellite Learning Center in Dallas, with specialized literature references and personnel, is important to the effort. Courses are also held in differing schools in the Dallas Independent School District, and when appropriate, to buildings in other districts. The multiple facilities allow for the greatest facilitation for full time teachers and administrators, and at the same time ensures the practicality of research resources, classroom access

for demonstrations, and the maximum transferability to the students who are campus based. While most of the campus courses for graduate students were taken during the summer sessions, some students were able to take evening courses at the University and increase their professional contacts.

The classes offered in the schools of the several districts have facilitated work with the community organizations, especially those that were Mexican American, since the students were, in fact, in the community. The arrangement also made it possible for a greater exchange of information with bilingual education personnel, principals, and others interested in the teaching of limited and non-English speaking pupils.

The East Texas State University Satellite Learning Center, with its expanded facilities for the library and for the staff, continued as an important resource for the faculty, district personnel, and the students. The extension of the ERIC and Lockheed search terminals to the center improved student and staff research capabilities.

The problems of small school districts are often quite different from those as large as Dallas or Fort Worth. The inclusion of more of these in the program has materially aided the provision of technical assistance to the districts, their bilingual and English as a Second Language programs, and the general interaction between the faculty and staffs of the schools, a mutually beneficial communications network for the districts and for the University.

APPROACHES TO THE EVALUATION

Three separate approaches were utilized in the evaluation of the East Texas State University Title VII Bilingual Education Program: internal, external formative, and external summative. The first, internal, had two sources - the regular University evaluation activities and the monitoring of all work by the administration of the Title VII project. The second, formative by an external evaluator, was accomplished through an exit interview and an interim written report at the conclusion of each external monitoring. The third, summative by an external evaluator, was primarily composed of the presentation of the data and conclusions through the annual report.

Internal Evaluation

East Texas State University maintained strict accounting of student enrollment, fiscal management, and faculty preparation for teaching the courses. The University was thus the most efficient source of information on these areas and it furnished reports on them to the funding source through its regular channels.

The supervisory functions of the deans of the colleges and of the heads of departments, added further dimensions to the management of the project. University wide committees on curricula, courses, and degrees contributed to the development of quality in the program. Faculty committees for the students seeking the undergraduate and graduate degrees, unique to each student or handled by an advisor, maintained an individual completion and quality control, as well as contributing to the students' development in the profession. The Academic Vice President was directly charged with the supervision of all teaching/learning programs, thus involving the central administration in the evaluation function.

Special advisory committees to the bilingual teacher training project also were constituted, including members from appropriate university entities, the Dallas Independent School District, students, and the community. These committees' functions in planning, assessment, and revision of the program helped assure that the objectives were reached.

The project staff also used a wide variety of consultants to aid in the several phases of the program. Representatives from the regional education service centers, the Texas Education Agency, community organizations, faculty from other universities, and the US Department of Education, added further depth to the evaluation. The continuous input, through the liaison personnel, from the aides, teachers, and administrators of the several schools and districts from which they came, also gave an internal formative evaluation dimension difficult to achieve in most university programs. The liaisons completed a standard form after each monitoring or assistance visits to the schools, with the district administration, and when participating in community activities. (See the form in Appendix B.) The information from these was integrated into the internal project reports at mid

SCHEMATUM OF THE PROJECT EVALUATION DESIGN

Internal	
Sources:	Monitoring:
University Departments, Colleges, Central Administration	Supervision of faculty and students, schedules, programs, and syllabi
Coordinator, Bilingual Education	Academic advising and review of student progress
Director, Title VII ESEA Project	General management and fiscal control of project resources
External Evaluator	Feedback from monitoring
External	
US Department of Education	Supervision of programmatic and fiscal elements
Dallas Independent School District and other participating districts	Recommendations on participants and programmatic aspects; feedback on student progress as they teach
Texas Education Agency	General supervision of the certification program and course offerings
External Evaluator	Monitoring of all activities through observations, interviews, and document reviews; evidenced in interim and final reports and conferences.

year and at the conclusion of the year, thus they were not included in this external report. Further, the information from the other internal evaluation activities were embodied in the project's reports and likewise were excluded from the present study.

External Evaluation

In 1976, East Texas State University contracted with a private firm, Development Associates with headquarters in Arlington, Virginia, and a branch office in San Antonio, Texas, to perform the external evaluation. The company has conducted many local, regional, and national surveys, needs assessments, and evaluation studies in the field of bilingual education. The agreement called for both formative and summative evaluation for the year 1976-1977.

Dr. Earl Jones, senior associate and bilingual education specialist, was assigned the major research tasks connected with the contract. His experience in bilingual education in Texas and Paraguay, and later in California and Guatemala, his proficiency in English and Spanish, his teaching, research, and administrative roles in schools and universities, together with his service in evaluating a large number of Title VII and other bilingual programs, gave him the wide perspective necessary for this project evaluation. (A curriculum vitae is included in Appendix A.)

The contract was renewed during the second year, 1977-1978. When Development Associates closed its Texas office, an agreement was reached whereby Dr. Jones would continue the external evaluation with the East Texas State University program as an independent affiliate with Development Associates. Subsequently, Dr. Jones was transferred to the San Francisco, California, office of the company as director of the Study of California Services to Limited and non-English Speaking Students, funded by the California Legislature. The independent affiliate relationship was maintained for the East Texas State University contract and the later formative and summative activities were conducted under that arrangement.

The funding for the formative and summative evaluation has always been severely limited. To maximize the utility of the activities, therefore, the agreement called for the following tasks, each to serve both functions:

- Monitor the graduate classes offered.
- Survey sample bilingual education classes taught by the participating students.
- Seek information on the conduct of the program from both district and University officials.
- Study the documents related to the project or emanating from it.
- Confer with the project personnel and teaching faculty on the implementation of the project.

Recommendations were to be made to the project staff after each task, providing formative information for the improvement of the program. Two monitoring schedules were provided and conducted, and both oral

and written interim reports were submitted to the director. Summaries of the findings were incorporated, when pertinent, within this annual report.

As a result of the first evaluation tasks in 1977, including a study of the project documents and conferences with personnel, a more precise investigation into the students' perceptions of the program was recommended. The agreement was modified to include this facet. The instruments were then derived cooperatively by the evaluator, the project director, and the faculty advisory committee. The questionnaires were administered, the data analyzed, and the results reported in each of the annual and interim reports since then. At the beginning of the present project year, a review of the results for the past several years showed a few questions producing little of utility to the project. The instrument was appropriately modified and the present version is contained in Appendix C.

Monitoring

Funding permitted two sets of monitoring, one conducted in late fall and the other in mid-spring. Regular class conduct was monitored during alternate observations of lecture, discussion, and other activities on the home campus and at the Satellite Center in Dallas. Even alternate sessions did not cover all the activities, and at times, classes, and the information was supplemented through open ended interviews with a sample of the students. Interviews with the professors and reviews of their syllabi furnished additional data on the courses and changes that were effected in them.

Additionally, a number of other activities of the project were monitored during the two periods: a special seminar by an outside consultant, meetings with the certification and advisory committees, a general student meeting, and special conferences with the University President, the Dean of Education, and the Head of the Department of Elementary Education.

Project Documentation

The project proposal and its subsequent negotiated modifications, the interim reports by the project personnel, and the continuation documents submitted to the US Department of Education, were provided for examination. Resource materials, research and class papers by students, correspondence with several agencies, and the project arrangements with the Federation of North Texas Universities were reviewed. Evidence of faculty and student participation in professional activities was also furnished.

The Student Perceptions Study

The student study was set up to provide interim data, via student opinions, on the conduct of courses, progress in Spanish, content or methods offered and needed, suggestions for improving the program generally, and ratings of their degree design. Additionally, the instruments were prepared so they could be coded and analyzed through computer services to reduce the costs to the evaluation and to furnish longitudinal analyses across the years.

The data analyses were performed at the Computer Center of Trinity University in San Antonio, Texas, the first two years, utilizing punch cards that could be input in subsequent years. These were later transferred to tape as the cumulated data became too bulky for punch card input. The process was continued via a

compatible program at San Francisco (California) State University since that time. (The coding and analysis setup were detailed in the 1976-1977 report and are not repeated herein.) Versions 6, 8, and 9 of the *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences* (Nie et al) were used. No names were used on the instruments but the students were asked to provide their social security numbers; when these were included, longitudinal tracking of changes in their perceptions was performed. Overall longitudinal studies, including all students, were also done.

The instrumentation comprised three separate forms. The first primarily sought certain biographical/demographic data to be used as possible differentiating variables for analyzing the long term results. Students were also asked to rate their proficiency in oral/aural and reading Spanish when they began the program. That rating on Form A, supplied the basis for subsequent analyses of progress in that language. Form B requested suggestions for improving the program and the individual courses, and obtained an update on their Spanish proficiency. The opinionnaire, Form C, in keeping with the general University policy of student evaluation of courses, gave the opportunity for rating the several design and conduct aspects of the courses, an overall rating on each, and estimates of the amount of Spanish used by the students and the professors in the courses. (All three forms are included in Appendix C.)

During the first year, the questionnaires were handed out during one of the last class periods with an explanation of the purpose. The students were urged to participate. The professor then left the room and those students who wished to complete an instrument, voluntarily, did so, handed them to a student who sealed them into a stamped envelope and mailed the package directly to the evaluator. Assurance was given that neither the project staff nor the professor would see the completed instruments. Students were allowed to submit evaluations without including their social security numbers if they wished. Slightly more than 10% of them has left this blank across the years.

The voluntary participation was disappointing in some classes, totalling about 20% in one case and rising to about 80% in others. The student monitor had been provided a list of the students and was asked to note those that had completed a questionnaire. Because of the relatively low rate of return, it was subsequently decided that the list might have been a deterrent to responding; it was thereafter dropped. The response rate for the following quarter then rose dramatically. Again, however, the rate decreased to its lowest level in the next quarter. Consequently, students were also given the opportunity to mail the questionnaire themselves. Professors were also reminded to distribute the forms since interviews showed that some had neglected to do so. An increase was then experienced but the return rates have varied considerably across the years since then.

Substantial increases in the instrument return rates have been experienced in the last three years: 135 in 1980-1981, 147 in 1981-1982, and 156 in 1982-1983. A part of the increase is due to more undergraduates taking more courses but graduate students are also completing more evaluations.

As will be seen in the tables reporting the results of the analyses, the N sizes were small for some courses and some sessions. In some courses, the number of students was quite small, especially those related to research and the individual projects, appropriate to the nature of that type of work. Absenteeism no doubt also accounted for some of the losses. The voluntary aspect also reduced the number sent in. Because of these circumstances, there was no necessary relationship between the number of respondents listed in the tables of this report and the enrollment in the courses. The small numbers weakened this portion of the study but could not have been avoided without prejudicing the rights of privacy of the students.

To ascertain whether the low response rate for some courses biased the calculated replies, an examination of them was conducted. The study showed that excluding those with only one or two forms, no necessary relationship existed between the number of respondents and the ratings; that is, students submitted instruments with low, medium, and high ratings in all but four courses. In those, no *weak* or *very weak* ratings were checked and only four *fair* replies were registered for all of the different course components. In two of the four only *strong* and *very strong* ratings were given. In other courses, however, and often involving the same students, some very low ratings were assigned. Interviews with some students were also conducted to examine the possibilities of biases and no direct relationships appeared. Some students who did not submit evaluations stated they simply did not do so; their stated ratings would have included the complete range of ratings offered. It is believed, therefore, that no substantial bias entered the ratings when three or more students completed the forms.

The instruments, as received via the mail by the evaluator, were then coded and keypunched for statistical analysis. The codings were 100% verified, the analyses performed, and the appropriate tables for the report were prepared. The computer cards for all the years to date were subsequently committed to magnetic tape for use in future longitudinal analyses.

Two kinds of data were transmitted to the project. The general information included in the tables in this report, plus the discussions with the director, was the first and most important to the formative evaluation. Professors were given the opportunity to request private data on their individual courses but only two did so. This annual report, including some analyses across the six years, was also to be tendered to the project director for the use of the University, the Bilingual Education Program, and the US Department of Education. The specific course designations are not disclosed within this report to protect the instructors.

Limitations to the Evaluation

Despite the several sources of information and the broad coverage of the design, one obvious weakness remained without investigation: the impact of the program on improving the teaching abilities of the students such that their pupils learned more. Stated more succinctly,

as a question, did the children in the classrooms of the students learn more because their teachers were participating in this project and degree program? The difficulties of such measurement are myriad and even controversial. The subject should not be avoided, however, simply because measurement is difficult and because the project lacked the funds and other resources to carry out such a study. Serious thought to providing at least some tentative conclusions should be given and some resources should be provided by the US Department of Education or other entities to conduct this important research.

Finally, the funding provided for external evaluation was small and the investigations, therefore, were necessarily brief, even in some cases cursory. The report must be taken within that limitation. Despite this handicap, a great deal of useful information was furnished throughout the study and that information helped the University and the project improve the program and its services. The external evaluator knows of no events or processes that were not scrutinized and therefore submits this report with confidence in the findings unless otherwise stated.

PROGRAM PROCESSES

East Texas State University has operated the ESEA Title VII Bilingual Program for seven years. In the first year, development activities occupied a large part of the administrative time and the program was begun at a highly functional rate. Several important changes were made during the year to strengthen both the participant benefits and the management capability so that still further improvements could be made in the future.

During the second year, the major processes were associated with the consolidation of management, enhancing the resources and services available to the participants and faculty, and the extension of the work to include a larger number of agencies and community institutions. The early cooperation with the Dallas Independent School District was continued and the McKinley Independent School District was added. East Texas State University membership in the Federation Bilingual Training Resource Center increased the resources available to the Title VII program and in return, the University contributed experience based knowledge to the management of the Federation operations. An augmented thrust the second year was the strengthening of the work with the Mexican American community, especially in the principal target area, Dallas, both by including that segment of the population in the management aspects of the program and in providing leadership enhancement services to its members.

In the third year, with the processes then principally at a routine level, the program further consolidated its service offerings and management systems, continued its work with the North Texas Federation and the community, and expanded its service area into new districts: Diocese of Dallas, Irving, Garland, Plano, Ennis, Mesquite, Mt. Pleasant, Paris, Tulia, and New Braunfels. Students were drawn from an even larger area while the participation from Dallas was increased. From the beginning, relations with the Texas Education Agency, the educational service centers, and other universities in the area were improved. One new element in the program was meetings with Native American groups to explore ways to serve that community component. Another addition was that of offering courses in Teaching English as a Second Language in conjunction with the Texas Education Agency. This was a valuable adjunct to the program and of inestimable assistance to the districts since little training in that field had been available previously.

The fourth year showed further consolidation and expansion of the program. The courses were updated and additional materials were included as they became available. Permission to grant a doctorate was sought and granted, and the federal funds for a few scholarships for that level were obtained. Specialist programs beyond the masters degree were also inaugurated. The number of undergraduate students was increased and the masters program continued to grow. Beginning efforts to provide assistance to other language groups, notably Vietnamese, were studied. The University/Texas Education Agency offerings in Teaching English as a Second Language were continued. Funds for the leadership development work with the Mexican American and

other community constituencies were not granted for this year but a part of that loss was taken up by student participants that carried out the work voluntarily. The North Texas Federation service activities were also discontinued; the several universities encompassed a part of the work within their regular programs but the loss of the considerable financial resources was significant.

During the fifth project year, East Texas State University was able to increase the participating student numbers even though many colleges were experiencing substantial decreases. Further, more and more students were being attracted to the program from other parts of the state, from other areas of the US, and from Mexico. A bilingual science educator was added to the faculty. Management changes were needed, also, to relieve the enormous burden that was shouldered by the administrators and the University was able to modify its staffing to improve the condition. The library continued its acquisitions and the Satellite Learning Center obtained a much larger holding of bilingual reference materials, as well as provivide more space for the staff.

The sixth program year gave more emphasis to the undergraduate instead of the graduate level; the undergraduates enrolled in greater numbers and there was some decrease in graduates. An endorsement plan to add English as a Second Language to the teaching certificate was approved and begun in operation. Several changes in the upper echelon of University administration were made and the new officers were oriented to the bilingual program.

Year seven saw the proportions of undergraduates and graduates remain about the same except that fewer doctoral fellowships were available. Administrative exigencies caused a consolidation of the two management posts into one; the long experience of the coordinator made it possible to continue effectively with the appointment of some of the faculty members to graduate faculty status and thus able to share the advising load. The news organ, *Boletín*, was removed from the budget but communications continued at a satisfactory level.

Administration

A major strength of the East Texas State University ESEA Title VII program was the dedicated early leadership of the director and assistant director. Their experience through the first four years allowed a careful transition from a beginning effort to one that operated with professional expertise. Their incorporation into the regular University faculty furthered the program institutionalization and improvement.

Contrary to arrangements in some ESEA Title VII projects, the personnel of the East Texas State University program has the full range of professorial duties: teaching, advising, committees, and administration. Institutionalization is therefore much higher than in most others; the work loads, however, are greater.

The cooperation among the personnel of the project, the departments, and the colleges not only continued but was increased, even though some of the persons occupying the administrative positions changed. A part of the continuance was the addition of personnel that knew about and supported bilingual education. The administration helped provide an environment in which the project could flourish. The new President, Academic Vice President, and Graduate Dean conferred with the coordinator and supported his efforts. The Dean of Education and Head of the Department of Elementary Education continued their active participation.

The office space allotted to the project last year was modified somewhat but the new arrangement is efficient since it provides a reception/typing area, a private office for advising/administration, and a separate room for the storage and control of the frequently used demonstration and reference materials. The latter furnishes much greater security for the materials since they must be checked in and out, and at the same time provides an office for the graduate assistant.

Changes in state laws and regulations necessitated their study and sometimes incorporation into the teaching or management within the program. Often these resulted in increased contacts with districts participating in the programs and communications with new ones. They naturally entail preparation by the staff so that whether affecting districts or the University, they can be incorporated with a minimum of distraction from the primary function, that of preparing highly qualified teachers, administrators, and special staff members. The project paid close attention to the proposed changes and managed them well.

Inter-Agency Cooperation

The University Title VII program cooperated fully with the Federation Training Resource Center during its existence; it continued that cooperation with the Federation and its members when that center was disbanded. Much of the coordination this year took place through the Fort Worth Region Service Center; the staff worked individually in producing many materials and served on several of the advisory committees for its functions.

Discussed in another section, the program cooperated with the Texas Education Agency in offering specific training in the teaching of English as a Second Language. Staff members also assisted in the formulation of the provisional plan for the endorsement to the teaching certificate in the beginning considerations and later submitting, through the Certification Committee, a model endorsement plan. The University's experience in offering the courses for the Texas Education Agency not only helped the Agency in its planning efforts but also prepared the University staff and the committees for the development of its own plan.

Students from East Texas State University and the other members of the Federation also continued their mutual crediting of specified courses anywhere within the group. This allowed for utilizing the greatest strengths of each University as well as facilitate early endorsement since the teachers could attend the institution most favorable to their own schedules.

Similarly, the University personnel aided with many activities of the Mexican American community, both to help in the development of the community and as an expression of its support. The *Cinco de Mayo* and National Hispanic Week activities were enhanced by the support of the students and faculty.

In addition, and as a part of its own community, the program cooperated with the campus organization, *Asociación Cultural de Hispano Americanos*, helping publicize the organization and its activities. This was a natural extension of the program. The project also assists other organizations for foreign students at the University and, in turn, obtains their help in the preparation for and conduct of the many multicultural efforts needed to train teachers for work in their districts. Since the program cannot possibly possess all the materials it needs for so many cultures, the cooperation pays substantial dividends.

Institutionalization

East Texas State University continued to support the ESEA Title VII program and to incorporate it directly into the regular structure of the University. The previously noted office space and division of administrative responsibilities are cases in point. In addition, special evidence of institutionalization was demonstrated in:

- . All the teaching positions were held by tenure track staff except one and discussions for resolving that remaining problem were underway;
- . The undergraduate and graduate endorsement requirements for teaching English as a Second Language were proposed by the faculty and approved by the Texas Education Agency;
- . All other certificate and degree programs were formalized and appeared in the undergraduate and graduate catalogs;
- . Library holdings in bilingual education and related fields were substantially expanded on the home campus and the Satellite Learning Center.

The faculty strength in delivering a part of the instruction in that language remained at a high level, not only in the bilingual education staff but also in several other departments that contribute to the instruction.

The bilingual education coordinator and the external evaluator met with the new President of the University shortly after he assumed his duties to present an overview of the previous years of work, the results of the evaluations, and the strengths and areas needing improvement. The Dean of the College of Education continued in strong support of the program. The new Graduate Dean and the new Academic Vice President had already worked with the bilingual education faculty and their continuing support was assured.

All of the interviews with the University officials produced expressions of their concerns and commitment. The desire to fully incorporate the program completely into the University structure remained undiminished, even though the full realization of that aim could not be totally accomplished. The University has, however, institutionalized the ESEA Title VII program into its regular structure more than any other known by the evaluator.

The evaluator would like to emphasize the importance of this aspect of the East Texas State University approach to the Title VII project since he also works with other university training programs. It has been relatively easy for some universities to grant special status to a federal program, exempting it from the usual control and administrative mechanisms. The projects have almost always suffered later. Cessation of the grant, difficulties with degrees and/or credits, permanent faculty appointment omissions, and similar problems have often resulted in the disappearance or substantial reduction in the university offerings and services. While obviously East Texas State University needed federal support - six years was a relatively short time to implement a program that was a new field - and especially when the increased demands for bilingual teachers were still evident, there was undeniable evidence of the incorporation of this program into the regular offerings and structure of East Texas State University. It was a clear case of federal monies well invested for the future. Additionally, the low income level of many of the participants justified the aid from tuition assistance.

Teaching Faculty

The University and the project continued to make important moves in improving the capability to deliver bilingual teacher training. In addition to the appointments cited in previous reports, several departments have added faculty with demonstrated ability to work in bilingual education and the necessary related fields. The University has an unusual strength in that field and in teaching English as a Second Language.

The University was also able to reduce its dependence upon adjunct faculty. Such faculty members, even when chosen with a great deal of care, do not always produce the highest amount of student learning. The one long term adjunct has the highest ratings in the faculty and was promoted this year.

The University faculty was observed to work hard in making the program a success, closely following the degree design specified for bilingual education. The students perceived some weaknesses and those are detailed in a later chapter. Some part of the weakness was due to the field itself - the relatively small amount of objective research relating implementation to student performance. Some progress was noted in this regard: the study for the California Legislature; a series of articles in the *Reading Teacher* and the *AERA Journal*; plus evaluations of small projects described in the ERIC entries. The faculty was aware of the new materials and were incorporating them into their instruction.

Another source of the complaints voiced in the interviews was the many non-program courses taken by the undergraduate students, who were in the majority in 1982-1983. Students criticized poor preparation for some classes, dwelling on inconsequential material, and in a few cases, insufficient attention to their needs. While no university condones these problems, the number of complaints was probably no greater than had the students of other programs been queried.

Most importantly to the long term view of the teaching, the number and severity of the complaints about the quality of instruction in the graduate courses decreased markedly. The renovation of the syllabi and the now continuous coordination of material across courses had largely eliminated the source of some graduate criticism.

Unfortunately, one area remained problemmatic for the undergraduates, that of the Spanish instruction. It must be noted, however, that some improvement in the ratings occurred, chiefly because one professor not previously included, was judged by the students to instruct well. The complaints registered in previous years about the denigration of Mexican American Spanish and about courses taught mostly in English, continued for two of the professors. The matter was again brought to the attention of the administration and reviews were promised. It must be emphasized that the graduate courses in Spanish were rated very high

The discussion of these problems is necessary but it should not be taken as a condemnation of the teaching within the program. To the contrary, the student ratings of the courses and the observed content coverage and teaching methods showed exemplary professor capabilities in most of them. "Tough but thorough" was a typical explanation for a professor that from the beginning has always had high ratings. "Demands a lot of work but teaches well," "knows bilingual education techniques and shows us how they should be conducted," and "it wasn't an English course but my writing improved because he demanded it" were other important responses. "I learned research in that course that wasn't even on research" was a complement any professor should be happy to merit. In summary, then, almost all of the professors in the program taught what they should and did it well. No program could ask for more - except to insist that all professors do that.

The amount of Spanish used in the classes has not increased much over the years. In some classes, 99% was conducted in that language; in others, nearly none. Several factors contributed to the differences. In some classes, there were so many monolingual English speakers that the professor would have been in error if he had conducted the classes in Spanish. Some professors, of course, did not speak fluent Spanish but most of these at least tried to use what they knew. One important technique observed in one course was that the professor, limited in Spanish, provided the necessary vocabulary for the content by writing the words on the board and obtaining help from Spanish speaking students in explaining them. Still another, who understood a great deal of Spanish but could not speak well, insisted that the Spanish speaking members of the class respond in Spanish. That, too, was a perfectly acceptable technique. In general, then, and considering the several factors, the amount of Spanish utilized in the courses was probably at about the level it could be. If the enrollment were higher, special Spanish sections could be formed but under the present circumstances, the various efforts to use that language were commendable.

The evaluator has had many opportunities to become well acquainted with some of the students who, because of necessary part time work, still remain. Two areas of improvement in oral Spanish have been noted in them: they used Spanish more and they made fewer errors. The increased vocabulary of the Spanish speaking Mexican Americans was notable. Vocabulary and pronunciation by the non-Mexican/Latin Americans improved. Students were also producing more project work in Spanish and that work was more accurate. Spelling improved, more diacritical marks were included, and the grammatical construction showed a better grasp of the language. An examination of some elementary teaching projects, for example, revealed few errors and even fewer clumsy phrasings. The writing in Spanish definitely increased and improved.

The general teaching practices of the faculty also improved. No complaints about lateness or absences of faculty were registered. None was alleged to have come to class unprepared. Three students suggested that one professor would be better with more elementary classroom experience. The observed preparation and subject dominance were high. Student participation was excellent. While to an outsider these would seem to be expected qualities, the reality in university

work, the reality in many university courses is less than desirable performance. East Texas State University definitely improved its teaching in the classes associated with the bilingual education program.

Not content with the present status in teaching, the project has continued its faculty development program with even more attention to instruction. Several seminars were held, both on the content of bilingual education and related topics, as well as on the methodologies for delivering them. Too, the University produced a student evaluation of the instruction and it was instituted during last year. While some professors were dissatisfied with the new system, the institutional pressure to improve instruction remained strong, as evidenced by the adoption of the evaluation.

Professionalization

The intensive duties of the staff in combination with the work in project and in regular departmental functions demonstrated an unusual commitment. It also restricted some activities that might lead to greater professionalization. Nevertheless, the faculty members found time to work on some research, consult with other universities and some districts, and conduct evaluations. The faculty continued to show its concern for professional development.

In the process of adopting a certificate endorsement for English as a Second Language, the Texas Education Agency requested input from several sources. The project staff participated in one held by universities with bilingual education departments, presenting a provisional plan for a degree and for a certificate. The State evolved a tentative set of courses and East Texas State University was one of those asked to provide suggestions on it. Additionally, a special English as a Second Language subcommittee of the bilingual education committee drafted a proposed plan for East Texas State University and it was accepted almost in its entirety, making it possible for some students to begin work on the endorsement almost immediately.

The faculty persisted in its work with the Texas Association for Bilingual Education, the TESOL group, and the Association of Teachers of Foreign Languages. Even though no funds were available for some meetings, faculty members paid their own way to participate.

A strong interest in professional reading was manifested in several faculty contacts. Some cited recent articles and research reports, commented on evaluations and new measurement procedures, and in other ways demonstrated a good grasp of what was new in bilingual education. Faculty use of the two data retrieval systems was evidenced. The use of the many bilingual materials housed in the curriculum library, the main library, and the Satellite Learning Center was high. The library continued to respond to student and faculty needs by increasing the holdings. A notable production was an annotated bibliography on bilingual legislation and court cases produced by one of the librarians.

Strong evidence of professionalization has been continuously noted throughout the project's life in the annual reviews of the offerings and modifications of them as required. The 1982-1983 study produced some substantial changes in the undergraduate and graduate degree programs for bilingual education. Some courses had already been introduced for the English as a Second Language endoresement. The latter was formalized this year and accepted by the Texas Education Agency. Similarly, the revisions to the degree and endorsement plans for the bilingual education portions were approved. (See Appendix A for these plans.)

Articles were submitted to area newspapers, radio and television programs, and these, plus direct letter communications continued to aid professionalization. These further helped reduce the effects of the loss of the project newsletter. The campus and faculty newsletters also aided in keeping information flowing.

Graduate student research, produced primarily in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the research methods course, continued to show high quality. The publications search, treatment of the materials, and clear distinction between the reporting and conclusions sections, were major advances. Three examples - "Bilingual Education as it Relates to LESA and non-LESA Students," "The Influence of Child's Self-Concept on Reading Achievement," and "A Comparative Study of Pre and Post Test Scores of Kindergarten Children Using the Caldwell Pre-School Inventory" - denote the difficulty of the topics undertaken, an indication of the seriousness of the graduate student work.

Professionalization in the East Texas State University ESEA Title VII project is at a high level. Plans for future studies and improvements will further that end.

Communicty Involvement

Although Title VII no longer funded the direct community involvement activities of the bilingual program at East Texas State University, the previous work was conducted so well that many continuing efforts could still be noted. Community leaders trained in earlier years remained active, promoting specific benefits for their communities as well as improving bilingual education. Faculty members, former students, and currently enrolled students were still contributing their skills to community development. Parental assistance with many activities in the schools with bilingual education remained quite high. The important work begun through the project was still paying dividends.

A second kind of involvement, that of the teaching community, was evidenced all through the present year. Teachers and administrators from the school districts were included in the advisory committee to the project; they were used as resources for the work and contributed a great deal to the formulation of the general policies and the conduct of the program. They were not seen as "objects" of the program, as is often the case, but as integral cooperators in a design and delivery system.

Yet another important evidence of the project's professional concern for the inclusion of the district teachers and administrators into the Title VII program was the consultation sought by them when problems arose in their schools. These requests for assistance and information have increased measurably across the years.

Not content with campus consultations, the East Texas State University, through its Title VII project and its own resources, provided in-school assistance via

the work of the liaison personnel. Every staff member was seen as a part of that system to provide services to, and at the same time gather information on needs from, the district personnel. Special liaison work was assigned as a part of some faculty members' work to ensure timely delivery of services to the schools and to the students. Regular visits were made to the schools, with advance notice, and assistance was given when requested. Further, reports on the monitoring of classes and on the assistance rendered provided a feedback to the project so it could improve.

The student evaluations of the liaison services have been more and more favorable through the project years. (A longitudinal report is included in a later section.) Some of this positive increase, of course, was due to the augmented capacity of the project to deliver this kind of service. The ratings also showed, however, that the teachers and administrators recognized that the University and the project could provide specialized services to bilingual education in their schools.

Other evidence of the recognition of the willingness and ability of the East Texas State University Title VII project to help with educational problems was that of the increased number of cooperating school districts. As new laws and regulations were promulgated, more and more districts called on the project to assist with compliance. Some districts have begun the planning and implementation of bilingual programs with the advice and counsel of project personnel, have urged their teachers to participate in the credentialing courses, and have made contributions to the work of the program. All of these, even those of only early formation, denoted acceptance of the Title VII project and its concern for involvement between the University and the districts.

While there are many positive sections to this evaluation report, probably no phase of the East Texas State University project reached the high degree of realization as that of professionalization. The author has evaluated university programs in Texas, Arizona, and California and has never found the superior quality evidenced at East Texas State University. The project was well integrated into the University, the school districts, and the communities. This commendable element in the project should be disseminated to other university projects and the personnel should be asked to assist others in achieving such a high degree of cooperation. Much of the project's success in other endeavors within its program was directly related to its commitment to professionalization - to its competence in the delivery of services to every part of its community.

Communications

The communications efforts were evident from all the explanations in the previous sections of this report, but they bear repeating for emphasis. The project worked hard at maintaining a dialogue with all its audiences: state agencies, other universities, its own university components, the districts, the Mexican American community, and the students. It actively provided information and sought information from them.

Resource Facilities

The East Texas State University project was especially cognizant of the need to provide a wide range of resource materials for the use of the faculty and students. While few Title VII funds were used in this acquisition, the project stimulated the collection of many materials and the accumulated resources were unusually large for such a project.

The campus library has been a major force in providing the resource materials. Primarily utilizing its own funds, this University component collected one of the best sets of materials yet examined by the evaluator. The collection was not only commendable for its materials on bilingual education but also on linguistics, Spanish, English, history, sociology, psychology, anthropology, and many other related fields. A part of the credit for this collection also was due to the faculty examination of the literature and suggestions that would further the study of their fields.

Some specialized curricular materials have been purchased with Title VII funds over the years and these were housed in a special office near that of the project to provide control over them. These include materials for nearly every grade and have been reported as unusually helpful to new districts offering bilingual and ESL education, as well as to established ones that want to change their curricula.

East Texas State University also maintains the Satellite Learning Center in the Dallas area and it, too, housed important materials to the work of the project. The site facilitated the use of the materials by the part time students who worked all day and had fewer opportunities to study on campus.

The professors who taught in the learning center also carried great amounts of books and curriculum sets with them, further increasing the exposure of the students to the special materials. They also carried some audio visual materials with them, adding student knowledge of what is available.

The arrangements with Dallas and the other participating districts also made more teaching materials available. Similarly, the Federation arrangement with the other North Texas universities included the use of their libraries, greatly enhancing the resources with fewer funds.

Summary of the Process Variables

The East Texas State University administration had gone to unusual lengths to incorporate the project work into the regular University structure. While it had not yet been able to manage all of the institutionalization that was planned, primarily because of financial constraints, it had achieved far more than any of the other Title VII projects the evaluator had studied.

Inter-agency cooperation was high, especially with the participating school districts, the other members of the North Texas Federation of Universities, the Texas Education Agency and its service centers, and among the departments and colleges of the home institution. Despite some major changes in the University administration, the project retained its support. The new officers took time to become acquainted with the work, the staff, and the evaluations. The assistance from the Dean of Education remained exemplary. Community involvement with the many population components in the areas of concentration, within the University,

and with professional colleagues was very high; the combination was commendable.

In review, East Texas State University and the ESEA Title VII Bilingual Program made substantial strides toward the best possible delivery of services to the students, the districts, and ultimately to the limited English proficient children in the State. The officials of both are congratulated for their persistent efforts toward these goals.

THE STUDENTS IN THE PROGRAM

East Texas State University conducted a needs assessment on the training required in the North Texas area at the beginning of its program. Utilizing the data available from the Texas Education Agency, published research, and surveys in the immediate geographic region, it was evident that the deficiencies in all levels of resources to conduct bilingual education were critical. The Mexican American population was growing very rapidly in the Dallas and Fort Worth areas; moderate increases were noted in the smaller population centers throughout the North Texas portion of the state.

The first thrust, and still the largest in terms of numbers, was the provision of bilingual education methods and techniques to already certified teachers in elementary schools. Two options were available: the courses needed for the endorsement to the elementary certificate and a full masters degree program in bilingual education. As soon as this program was stabilized, the University then planned and negotiated approved programs for undergraduates so they could enter the bilingual education field directly; a specialist program beyond the masters degree was needed that would equip experienced personnel to aid the administration and teachers in the implementation of bilingual education; and the doctorate in education, which would provide both specializations and at the same time furnish high level personnel for other functional positions in universities, agencies, and local administrations.

All four levels were direly needed throughout the North Texas area and the nation. Increases in the number of pupils that could benefit from bilingual education and programs to serve them, have kept the demand high. The four programs are still needed if the students in elementary and secondary schools are to be educated within an environment that will facilitate their abilities to enter, profit from, and contribute to the educational, social, political, and economic life of the state and the nation.

Program Participants

The majority of the East Texas State University Title VII participants came from the Dallas Independent School District, which cooperated directly with the program. Many others, however, came from other districts in the North Texas area, and recently, from all over Texas.

In the early years, almost all the participants were teachers in the first four grades of school since that was the emphasis for bilingual certification. Since that time, the numbers of participants from the other grades and from other positions in the schools have increased markedly, demonstrating an attraction to the East Texas State University program. That change is significant since several universities in the area offer some levels of training for bilingual education.

The University guarantees the privacy of information, therefore, the reporting on the several characteristics studied is voluntary. Too, many students participating in the courses were not assisted financially by Title VII. The two factors combine so that the percentages cited in the accompanying tables do not necessarily translate into the numbers officially registered as ESEA Title VII participants.

The wide variety of occupations of the reporting participants is displayed in Table 1. The changes across the years represent differing emphases in the schools, on the privision of bilingual education and ESL in different grades, and the group receiving special assistance from the project.

Table 1: Comparative Frequencies of Reporting Participants by Occupation from 1976 to 1983

Occupation	1976 %	1977 %	1978 %	1979 %	1980 %	1981 %	1982 %	1983 %
Teacher: kindergarten	10	12	12	14	12	4	3	1
grades 1-3	36	47	48	43	30	27	22	27
grades 4-6	13	13	14	4	15	12	9	12
grades 7-8	4	2	4	8	3	8	6	*
grades 9-12	3	1	4	7	7	6	5	14
adult	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Aide	**	**	**	**	6	8	5	0
Volunteer	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
Administrator	2	2	3	6	6	2	3	3
Computer/media	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
Curriculum writer	1	2	2	2	3	2	1	1
Resource teacher	1	1	2	2	4	0	1	1
Student/unemployed	**	**	**	**	6	18	42	38
Unspecified other	15	13	11	24	1	4	1	0
No response	1	9	0	0	0	3	2	0

** Grades 7 through 12 were combined into a single "secondary" response.*
***Between the 1979 and 1980 reports, the computer program was expanded to account for these specifications formerly grouped under "other."*

The principal drawing area was the Dallas area; as the teachers there gained the credential and/or degree, decreases were expected. However, these were partially offset by the inclusion of other area districts and by losses from the already prepared teachers. The large increase in students that were unemployed mostly resulted from the changed emphasis to funding that group.

The total and bilingual teaching experience of the students in the first few years was fairly stable. As many of the experienced instructors completed their certifications and degrees, the total experience diminished. The bilingual experience continued to rise until 1982, when the higher proportion of undergraduates diluted that factor. Similarly, the 1983 offerings for ESL teachers, many of whom do not teach in bilingual education, decreased the experience variable for bilingual but not the total years. Table 2 compares the frequencies for both total and bilingual experience for the last five years; 1979 was representative of the previous project years and thus the entire project period would have added little to the information.

Table 2: Comparative Frequencies of the Total and Bilingual Teaching Experience of the Participants: 1979-1983

Experience Categories	Total					Bilingual				
	1979 %	1980 %	1981 %	1982 %	1983 %	1979 %	1980 %	1981 %	1982 %	1983 %
None	4	4	12	39	33	8	6	22	44	48
Less than one year	8	6	16	14	14	29	21	29	19	17
One to two years	18	11	16	11	15	22	11	16	14	16
Three to five years	29	39	14	11	12	25	38	14	5	9
Six to ten years	18	20	14	8	19	10	12	4	7	11
Eleven years or more	23	20	16	8	11	6	12	2	2	3
No response	0	0	10	3	6	0	0	0	9	5

The relatively large increase in the "none" category in 1983 when compared to 1982 represents mostly those teachers returning to the University to gain the ESL training, many of whom had not been involved in bilingual education. The number of undergraduate students, also a part of the "none" category, remained about the same although their percentage of the total reporting was slightly smaller than the previous year.

The proportion of male to female students was stable the last four years with only minor variations. (Table 3) The proportion of males continued higher than in the early years of the project.

Table 3: Male and Female Proportions among the Student Populations: 1979-1983

Sex	1979 %	1980 %	1981 %	1982 %	1983 %
Male	12	19	16	18	18
Female	88	81	84	82	82

Ethnicity changed a great deal in 1981 and some of that difference remained in 1982 and 1983. In all the earlier years, Mexican Americans had made up more than half. In the latter years, the number decreased, as did the percentage, while the number of Anglos and other Latin Americans increased. It should be noted, however, that some Mexican Americans that speak little or no Spanish classified themselves in the "Anglo and other" category. (Table 4)

Table 4: Reported Ethnicity Frequencies: 1979-1983

Ethnicity	1979 %	1980 %	1981 %	1982 %	1983 %
Mexican American	53	55	37	43	41
Other Latin Americans	0	7	8	10	11
Black	2	0	2	1	1
American Indian	0	0	2	2	1
Anglo and other	45	38	52	44	46

The proportion of the students that already held the bilingual endorsement grew very rapidly from 1977 through 1980. In 1981, however, the percentage dropped dramatically from the previous high of 64% to 26%. Many of the 1981 students were new to the program and/or were undergraduates, and had not yet had time to complete the certificate courses. In 1983, that percentage remained low since many were seeking the ESL endorsement.

Seven years of examining student characteristics has found important differences. The early years of being one of the first university programs to make the certificate available, attracted a large number of experienced persons to the degree program. Many Mexican Americans were among that early group. Later, Anglos and others were attracted; even more of this group appeared when the ESL endorsement program was approved. Similarly, the emphasis on undergraduates reduced the proportions of both total and bilingual experience among the students; the latter was reduced even further with the ESL program.

These changes, however, correspond to the reality of what was happening in the districts, among students generally, and within the University. East Texas State University and the ESEA Title VII project have been able to meet the current needs of the students and of education in the State of Texas.

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF THE SERVICES

Many universities have begun programs for bilingual education; some of them have experienced little or no growth. One of the problems has been a restrictive set of course offerings that did not appeal to the students. Still another has been offerings by professors who were unprepared in bilingual education or who continually dwelt on philosophical issues or personal campaigns of one sort or another but who did not progress to a high degree of technical teacher preparation. None of these conditions has produced attractive programs to a large number of students.

To help assure that both the program and the courses met the students' needs, the East Texas State University Title VII project set up a close monitoring system, utilizing both expert judgment about the courses and the way they were taught, and student perceptions of the program as a whole and its parts. As each set of course observations was completed, oral and written interim reports were submitted so that the project administrators had the opportunity to talk with the instructors, giving helpful suggestions for improvement. In addition, the observor offered private, individual conferences to any professor that so requested, again to offer suggestions. Further, the students rated each course and the rating forms were sent to the evaluator. The results were summarized, sent to the administration, and offered to any professor that desired the information on his specific course.

The present document, because of the anonymity requirements, does not identify professors or courses; these were discussed as they related to the Title VII project's attempts to produce the best possible environment for learning. Reiterating from the methodology section, the student evaluations were voluntary, thus some courses received few ratings. Also, some courses in students' programs were not exclusively for bilingual education and one or only a few students might be enrolled in them. This reduced the statistical inferences that could be made from the ratings. The discussions in this chapter will be concerned principally, then, with those courses for which three or more forms were returned. The narrative suggestions, however, were utilized for the entire range of courses in which the reporting students were enrolled.

General Perceptions

The students were asked to rate the general program in which they were enrolled plus their fluency in Spanish. In addition to one point in time assessments, their ratings were examined across the years they were enrolled, giving both a cross sectional and a longitudinal analysis of these two general elements.

The first element, the degree design, was examined in the present report in two ways. First, the ratings by all students reporting each year were compared across the last four years. Many in 1981

even more in 1982 were just beginning their programs under the project and few chose to judge them at that point; in 1983, however, they had progressed far enough to feel competent to rate the program. (See Table 5.)

The mean rating given by those responding was greater than the *strong* category. It was higher than had ever been recorded previously. The improvements in the degree design (Appendix A) were probably involved; comments also suggested that a former advisor, no longer with the project, had sometimes "misled" them and they appreciated the higher quality in 1982-1983.

Table 5: Rating Frequencies and Calculated Composite Means on Degree Design

Rating Category*	1978 %	1979 %	1980 %	1981 %	1982 %	1983 %
Very strong	10	6	18	14	16	25
Strong	47	53	51	41	41	51
Fair	39	30	27	16	8	10
Weak	1	2	1	2	0	0
Very weak	1	0	0	0	0	0
No response	2	10	3	27	35	12
Composite Rating	3.62	3.72	3.88	3.91	4.08	4.12

* *Very strong=5, strong=4, fair=3, weak=2, very weak=1; no response was eliminated from the calculations for the composite ratings.*

The 1983 rating was not statistically different from that of 1982 but it was (.001) when compared to 1978 and 1979. The degree design is a complicated variable but the students saw improvement over the years.

The influx of students seeking the ESL endorsement but not that of the bilingual credential has complicated the comparisons of increased Spanish fluency across the years. Substantial increases had been registered during 1981 and 1982 but the many participants not studying Spanish in 1983 clouded the issue for 1983. Mathematically, the proportion indicating progess declinced but it is unlikely that this was true for those enrolled in Spanish courses and in the bilingually taught methods courses.

The number of undergraduates and the ESL teachers new to the program lowered the proportion of those who could judge the liaison services to the schools and teachers. The mean rating, between *fairly* and *very effective*, remained at the same level as for 1982. It has been quite stable across the years. Those who know the program rate it quite highly.

Few evaluator observations of the liaison visits can be conducted during the monitoring due to the press of time. It is necessary to rely heavily, then, on the interviews with the participants. Their comments range widely in content, depending upon the nature of the assistance that is furnished, but their qualitative judgments are much like those in the ratings: it is a worthwhile program component. It is important to note that almost all of them express the opinion that more liaison visits would help them and their schools in reaching the limited English speaking children.

Table 6: Frequencies and Composite Ratings of the Liaison Services: 1979-1983

Response Categories*	1979 %	1980 %	1981 %	1982 %	1983 %
Very effective	16	20	16	17	14
Fairly effective	13	27	4	10	8
Not effective	4	6	0	0	0
No response/Not observed	67	47	80	73	78
Composite rating	1.4	1.3	1.3	1.4	1.4

* *Very effective=2, fairly effective=1, not effective=0; no response/ not observed excluded from the calculation of the composite rating.*

In earlier years, the evaluation included the consultant portion of the project. The general reduction of funds at the University has considerably reduced the number of speakers that can be brought in. The project continued to cooperate with other organizations on the campus and in the Satellite Learning Center area to provide what it could. The component was dropped from the new evaluation form because of the scarcity of resources for its realization.

Overview of the Services

The major services were rated at about *fair* in the earlier years; those ratings have improved during the past four years or have remained stable. The most important increase in the ratings has been for the degree design, a vital element to students. Changing participant composition, due to ESL students, was thought as a potential reduction about services but the newer entrants that replied about the services answered much as the bilingual students did.

PERCEPTIONS OF THE INSTRUCTION

The East Texas State University Title VII project has emphasized the improvement in the delivery of its services to the students. The provision of materials, professors experienced in bilingual education, and assistance to those professors was expected to create a teaching/learning environment that would maximize the participant benefits from this most important portion of the program. Greater learning by the students, who are the teachers and specialists in the districts, would then benefit the pupils in those districts by increasing their learning.

University systems are such that a special project cannot demand changes in the way the courses are taught; it can only offer assistance and suggestions so that those who want to improve can do so. Individual professors are jealous of their courses and sometimes resist modifications that might make their work more acceptable to students, reasoning that their subject matter is more important than what the students think. Too, circumstances do not always permit a University the ideal choice for an instructor in a particular course. East Texas State University has continually worked toward the long range goal of improved teaching, both by offering assistance and by choosing the best personnel it can find.

Some subjects, however, are less well received in and of themselves and these tend to receive less favorable evaluations from students. Subjects that are totally new to the students, ones that require an unusual amount of outside study, and those that are more theoretical than practical are among the less favored materials. Additionally, not all students perceive the conduct of a course alike. Variations in their perspectives, their preparation, and their intentions when they signed up for a course all contribute to differentials in the ratings given.

Nevertheless, the University insists that student perceived information about the courses is a valuable input to the improvement of the project services. The continuous experience of the evaluator with this program demonstrated that such is the case. Each year several professors have requested private information about their course ratings, have discussed the student perceived deficiencies and strengths with the evaluator, and have subsequently modified the offerings such that their ratings have improved.

Two types of information were gathered about the courses: one was the ratings on the courses and the instructional components of them. The ratings provided direct measurement for the evaluation and benchmarks against which the professors could strive for improvement. The second type was suggestions from the students on how to improve the courses. These were important adjuncts to the scale values (*very strong, strong, fair, weak, very weak*) on a Likert scale of 1 to 5 (a reversed polarity), which allows for statistical analyses of the results. The suggestions for improvement and the general comments about courses are usually not quantified since their voluntary

inclusion does not necessarily indicate the number of students holding that opinion.

In a few instances, a comment or suggestion will be so pervasive that the proportion of students indicating it is provided, either because the number was small and therefore might not represent the ideas of the group, or when the number was large and thus demonstrated a general perception. The anonymity of the professors was guaranteed and that sometimes caused comments to be deleted from the report since their inclusion would point directly to one instructor. When a suggestion was positive, posing no threat to the professor, it was incorporated even though identification might be possible.

Program Design

Each student was asked to comment on or offer suggestions about how the general design of the program could be enhanced. Across the four years, these have decreased considerably, apparently reflecting the higher positive ratings given the courses during that time. That is, it appeared that in most cases when students were satisfied with the courses, they felt less inclined to write out general comments. That is not absolute, however, since two conditions in 1979-1980 caused them to include substantial narrative information and the positive comments have continued since then.

First, two less than positive conditions were commented on extensively. Over the years, but in lesser quantities each year, the students have expected that the professors would use more Spanish in the conduct of the classes. As discussed in a previous section, the amount of Spanish that could be used was in part dictated by the proficiency of the professor and in part that of the students. The suggestions did note differences but still indicated their own concerns for greater fluency in Spanish and the recognition that its utilization in the classes could help them improve.

The second type of comment was that engendered by perceived improper conduct of a course. The students might be generally satisfied with their program but regard a particular course as needing improvement. While some of these were discussed earlier, the most important ones are reiterated here for emphasis:

- Students expected that Spanish would be the dominant language in a Spanish course; they objected strenuously when one undergraduate course was taught primarily in English.
- Both Mexican Americans and non-Mexican Americans objected to disparaging remarks made about Mexican Americans and/or about their Spanish.
- Criticisms about several undergraduate, non-program courses were frequent; the grading system was criticized in some of the courses.
- The graduate courses, especially those on Spanish, enjoyed very favorable comments.

These findings were relayed to the administration of the project and to those professors that requested private information on their own courses. The project and University administrations were aware of most of these problems and were seeking ways to alleviate them. At least one professor made a determined effort to improve the delivery of the courses between the fall and spring sessions and the spring comments showed some success in this regard.

The positive comments, mentioned earlier, far out weighed those that were less favorable. In fact, most courses received a considerable number of notes about the amount of learning, the excellent information that had been imparted, and the methods used in teaching them.

Another kind of suggestion emanated from a 1981 course added to the program. All the students but one in that course took the time to write a substantial narrative about it, praising the professor, the project, and the inclusion of the course in the design. As an illustration of the strength of the offering, the following excerpts from the comments are presented:

> ...this course should be a prerequisite, to be taken before the other bilingual courses...
>
> ...this course should be offered at the beginning of the Masters program.
>
> I learned more about writing and improving my Spanish fluency in this course than in any I have ever taken.
>
> ...is to be congratulated for the finest course ever presented in this or any other program in which I have been enrolled.
>
> Now I want more; a followup course or courses on Spanish grammar and composition would greatly improve this program.

These are especially important judgments since the students were by no means talking about an easy course. Included in their comments were phrases such as "...toughest course ever..." "...hard professor but knows her business and how to teach it..." "worked harder on this course than all the rest combined." The only negative comments, and those were still tempered by praise for the course and the professor, came from students who felt that their level of proficiency in Spanish caused them some difficulties.

Nearly every student suggested that the course be offered very early (or first) in the program. It would appear to the evaluator, however, that some study of the case should precede such a move. A good many of the students in this course were not very proficient in Spanish when they began their work at East Texas State University. No doubt some could have taken the course almost immediately but some would have had many difficulties and perhaps not have learned as much as they did at this later time. If there were enough students, the best might be to offer a section early to students very fluent in Spanish and then another later on for those that need to improve their fluency first.

In general, then, the program design, as seen through the degree design and the comments regarding it, has shown a steadily improving rating across the years. The increase for this year, according to the narratives written by the students, was due to the revisions of the program, the addition and continuance of some courses they felt to be unusually useful, and improved relations in advising.

Course Ratings

The number of courses rated during the present and the past years was substantially higher than in previous evaluations, primarily because of the number of undergraduates. Similarly, these represented many more subjects than in the early years; that factor made generalities about the overall ratings meaningless since most students have some subject area they do not enjoy or with which they have difficulties. To alleviate this potential problem, the subjects were grouped by areas to give a more useful evaluation.

Table 7 contains the information for the present and past years. Note especially that the polarity is reversed from many common scales: the best rating is *1=very strong* and *5=very weak*, thus the smaller the number, the better the students judged the courses in that subject area.

Table 7: Comparative Overall Ratings by Students of the Courses Taken to Fulfill their Degree Requirements: 1981-1982 and 1982-1983

Course Areas	Undergraduate		Graduate		No. of Reports
	1982	1983	1982	1983	
Language:					
English	1.85	1.33	-	1.33	19
Spanish	3.33	2.06	1.22	1.24	41
French	2.30	2.50	-	-	5
Linguistics	3.33	1.00	-	1.33	7
Education:					
Elementary	2.50	1.97	1.62	1.58	18
Secondary	-	1.50	-	-	3
Social Sciences:					
History	1.45	2.00	-	-	7
Political Science	2.50	2.50	-	-	4
Psychology	1.78	2.35	-	-	3
Sociology	2.25	3.00	-	-	7
Mathematics/Science:					
Mathematics	1.80	2.00	-	-	5
Biology	1.50	1.75	-	-	3
Botany	-	2.83	-	-	5
Earth Sciences	1.00	1.00	-	-	2
Others:					
Computer Science	-	1.00	-	-	1
Physical Education	2.75	2.75	-	-	5

* *The overall rating was given by the students and is not a mathematical mean of the other detailed ratings.*

Few substantive changes were seen between 1981-1982 and 1982-1983 when sufficient numbers of students reported on their courses, except for undergraduate Spanish. Severe problems have been noted since the inception of the project, thus a more than one point gain toward the higher rating, almost reaching the *strong* category, is notable. Undergraduate English and linguistics also improved but the numbers reporting this year were smaller than last year. Nevertheless, the changes were laudable. Graduate ratings of English, Spanish, and linguistics remained a commendatory part of the program.

Undergraduate education courses also were given higher ratings than for the previous year. The judgments on the graduate program courses in elementary education continued at a strong to very strong level.

The undergraduate social studies courses remained about as they were or declined somewhat. The numbers were not large in any of them but two that registered a lowered rating had seven students each. The strong ratings for the mathematics and science courses continued that trend when the subjects could be compared across the two years. This has been a characteristic of the undergraduate students in the project, indicating a strong preparation in those fields.

The comments on the undergraduate courses were scarce; most students simply left the spaces blank. The few that did comment tended to be positive, suggesting a general satisfaction with the course. It is notable that fewer negative comments were registered on the undergraduate Spanish courses than had held in earlier years.

Graduate students were somewhat more inclinced to comment and almost all of them were positive. The substantive favorable narratives about the Spanish courses continued much in the same vein as in other years; they are seen as a highly useful part of the program. Linguistics, which as come in for some negative feelings some years, was characterized by the students as practical and well taught.

Elementary education courses for the graduate students received high praise for the most part. For the first time, however, three students of a course suggested that the professor would have been better with more elementary classroom experience. None elaborated on how that was manifested in the course.

As a generality, then, those courses "controlled" by the project were highly rated and while much the same in the present year as the last, were much stronger than in some earlier years. Too, there was very little variation among the different courses, denoting an overall trend toward very strong instruction. The undergraduate courses differed more in their ratings but they, too, were seen by the students as providing the desired information appropriately; only the social sciences displayed any tendency to be rated lower than in other years.

The degree design, program activities, and course ratings for this year were all in the favorable to very high range. The revisions and working with the professors to improve the offerings showed progress - and that was difficult for most areas since they were already quite high. The East Texas State University ESEA Title VII project is to be commended for its continuous improvement.

THE FOLLOWUP SURVEY

The East Texas State University ESEA Title VII Bilingual Program has carefully evaluated its important phases throughout its seven year life, obtaining the opinions and suggestions of students annually. These, in turn, have been computerized to allow for trends across the years. The mass of data, considerably attenuated during the past two years because of costs and utility for the present, have allowed many modifications in the operation of the program and, as seen in the earlier sections, a great deal of improvement. Indeed, the annual evaluations in recent years have shown the program to be strong in its component parts.

Not content with always viewing present-time data, the project decided to conduct a followup survey, apart from the regular annual evaluation, that would allow the past students, as well as those currently enrolled, to express their opinions and give suggestions for still further improvement. The suggestions of past students were accorded greater merit since they were no longer directly affiliated with the University and were employing what they had learned there, or feeling the lack of learning, in their positions.

Two approaches were taken to the survey. First, the program secretary undertook to contact all the previous students that had completed one or more semesters under funding from the ESEA Title VII project. The basic information on their present occupations, whether utilizing bilingual skills or not, and their current addresses. The second approach was that of mailing out a survey form to those for whom addresses could be verified; some, of course, had moved and left no forwarding address and could not otherwise be located. This was especially true for the first three years of the project; incomplete records also hampered the search for some former students.

The total possible former students was 163 for the period that could be verified. However, 24 of these could not be located, leaving 129 potential respondents. A summer mailing, necessary under the circumstances but always deficient for finding teachers, resulted in a return of 50 instruments by the time this report was written. Any additional forms obtained will be added into a later report.

The instrument, presented in Appendix C, contained many similar elements to that used for the annual evaluations. To allow for separate calculations of the data, present from past enrollment was contained as an introductory item. Exactly half was enrolled at the time the survey was answered. Their present/past experience since enrollment, whether the experience involved bilingual or ESL, was requested. The possession of bachelor, masters, or doctorate degrees, whether they were obtained at East Texas State University or elsewhere, and a category for those that took only a few courses at the University checked that portion of the educational experience. Similarly, possession of the bilingual and other certificates and where they were obtained furnished valuable information.

An opinionnaire section followed, seeking the participants' judgments about the several subject areas in their studies at the University, as well as their endorsement/certificate and degree programs. Finally, they were asked to rate their East Texas State University program as a whole. Equally important with the ratings, the respondents were asked to add any comments about each opinion component, explaining their ratings or offering suggestions.

The forms were forwarded to the evaluator, who analyzed the answers and prepared

the present report. The provisional nature of the present information must be stressed since more forms will be returned later.

Characteristics of the Survey Students

The direct contact survey by the program secretary produced both primary (discussions with the former student) and secondary (information from other sources) data on them. Slightly over 89% was employed in a bilingual setting, teaching or in some other way, serving the bilingual populations of their schools, districts, and universities. Some, of course, had been promoted to non-classroom positions but in any event, they were still concerned with children speaking languages other than English. The East Texas State University has, then, admirably served its principal purpose of adding to the resources available to limited and non-English speaking children.

The remaining 10.8% was in a variety of positions, mostly those of teaching in a regular, full English classroom. Only three persons were in non-education positions, all in business requiring no Spanish in their opinion.

The mail form respondents, as noted previously, contained half currently enrolled. Many of these, however, were also teaching or working in other positions at the same time. The declared occupations (Table 8), showed only 16% to be full time students. Sixty percent of the respondents was in the teaching profession; the others were in related fields.

Table 8: Occupations of the Responding Survey Students as of Summer 1983*

Occupation	Percent	Occupation	Percent
Elementary teacher	54	Instructional specialist	2
Secondary teacher	10	Education writer	2
Aide	2	Curriculum coordinator	2
Volunteer	2	Business	2
Substitute	2	Bilingual secretary	2
Adult ESL	2	Student	16

** One person did not respond to this question.*

Of those who were not teaching at the time of the survey, 14% had taught since completing their studies at the University. Totalling those now teaching with those that had in the past, at least some of that experience was bilingual, 74%, and/or ESL, 48%. The undergraduate students, some of whom had taught and some had not, complicated the separation of them from the results of this question.

Eighty-eight percent of the respondents had already achieved the bachelors degree; twenty-six percent had obtained it from East Texas State University. The large number of masters students, plus those from other Federation universities who came in for special courses or the certificate program, accounted for the others. This is emphasized in the percentage with masters degrees - 38% - and with 63% from this University. Only two doctoral students replied; one had received the degree from East Texas State University and the other elsewhere.

Some fourteen percent noted they had taken only a few courses at East Texas State University, mostly these were Federation students.

A major goal of many students in the program is the acquisition of the bilingual endorsement to the elementary teaching certificate. Three avenues were open to them: 1. complete all the requirements at East Texas State University and be recommended by that institution; 2. apply directly to the Texas Education Agency, receive a deficiency plan if they lacked any of the requirements, complete those at a university, and then submit the transcripts to the Agency; 3. participate in a district preparation program and take courses at a university, and be recommended by the district when the requirements were met. Forty-four percent of the respondents had already achieved that goal; 40% had done so directly through the Title VII program, the others taking some courses at East Texas State University and submitting the transcripts to districts or directly to the Agency.

Students who planned their degree programs accordingly, or who had the necessary transfer courses, were able to obtain other certificates or endorsements as well. Those attained by the respondents included: elementary (7), kindergarten (4), supervisor (3), special education (2), mentally retarded (1), Spanish (2), and ESL (2). The latter will, of course, increase substantially during the next few years.

In general, then, the respondents represented the program participants for the years encompassed. Obviously, the responses from the earlier years were few; their changes of residence made contacting them more difficult. The combination of undergraduate and graduate students, the different degree and certificate programs, and the conditions of the bilingual education programs in the districts were reflected appropriately among the Title VII participants.

Course Grouping Judgments

As noted at the beginning of the survey section, it was expected that those who had completed their work at the University and while in the profession had some opportunities to judge the program components more objectively, might rate their courses and degree designs differently than those still in school. That was true, however, in only one case; the graduate students no longer in school judged the Spanish courses even higher than did those now enrolled. The mean ratings for all other program elements were not significantly different when separated by former and present students. *(See Special Note to Table 9.)*

Table 9: Mean Ratings of the Survey Respondents on the Program Course Groupings

Course Grouping	Mean	Course Grouping	Mean
Spanish*	4.35	ESL methods	4.03
English	3.77	Other language methods	3.73
Social studies	3.77	Social/multicultural methods	4.30
Mathematics/science	3.48	Methods for other subjects	3.88
Bilingual methods	4.11		

** The mean for former graduate students was 4.87; undergraduate students, whether present or past, was 3.46.*

SPECIAL NOTE: In the sections of the annual evaluation, the rating scale was in reverse polarity with 1=very strong and 5=very weak. In the survey, 5=very strong, 4=strong, 3=fair, 2=weak, 1=very weak. The change was intentionally made to avoid routine replies. No respondent confused the scales.

Spanish enjoyed the highest rating of any course grouping, one-third higher than *strong*. There were also more comments appended to this item than any other. The majority of these were summary statements about the excellence of the courses. All the other directly positive notations commended the graduate Spanish professor for her knowledge, methods, and ability to motivate the students. Two graduate students recommended more practice and instruction on writing Spanish and two requested more courses on the language. Five undergraduate students repeated the complaints that have been nearly constant through the years: Spanish courses taught in English and one professor that ridicules Mexican Americans' Spanish.

The social studies/multicultural methods courses received a rating almost as high as Spanish, 4.30, again a third above the *strong* rating. Few comments were registered: one commended a workshop on multicultural methods as the best ever taken; two suggested that more courses be taught on this subject and that how to teach awareness of multicultural strengths would help the teachers.

The bilingual methods courses also received a better than *strong* judgment, 4.11. Some general statements about the utility and relevancy of the courses were included and one praised the staff highly. The only complaint was that the respondent felt that more writing methods should have been included.

The ESL methods courses also merited a *strong* rating, 4.03, and the second largest number of comments within this group; all from graduate students. The necessity and relevance of the subject were observed by eight respondents. Four made general positive statements about the work. One noted that the opportunity to find out what other teachers were doing was of special practicality. Two felt that the professors needed more elementary classroom experience and another noted that the information was mostly for elementary teachers and dwelt little on the teaching of ESL in secondary schools.

All the other subject groupings were judged between *fair* and *strong*. While only a few *weak* and no *very weak* ratings were marked in this survey, almost all of the *weak* judgments were given to this group. That is, there was a wide variation in the ratings, not unexpected since many professors were involved across the years. Too, few comments were appended to the items covering these course groupings; these tended to be specific statements, mostly negative, about particular professors.

In any survey of this type, there is always the concern that those feeling more positive toward the program and courses would be more likely to complete the form and return it. A comparison of the course ratings with those of previous years suggests that this did not happen. Undergraduates judged the courses almost exactly as they had each of the past three years. Graduate student ratings tended to be more positive than previously but their time away from the University probably explains that differential. When enough comments were included, such as was the case for Spanish, English, bilingual and ESL methods, they supported the ratings given. No systematic biases could be ascertained from the examination of the survey with the annual ratings.

Program Judgments

Three general program ratings were sought in the survey, two specific to the project (endorsement/certificate and degree designs) and one probed the overall East Texas State University experience. Almost no comments were appended to the ratings of the endorsement/certificate programs but the general University experience item brought a host of comments, both specific to the University and

to the courses, professors, and other program components. A few commented on the degree design.

The endorsement/certificate programs received an almost exactly *strong* rating, 3.93, and there was little variation among the respondents; an almost equal number judged them *fair*, *strong*, and *very strong*. Since there were no comments, no analysis of the differences could be made.

The degree design was given a higher rating, 4.08, just above *strong*. The few comments indicated that the students involved in transfers to other universities had experienced some difficulty. One complained generally about the Federation regulations, another said that acceptable courses to other Federation universities should be more clearly marked (one course did not transfer). The favorable comments centered on the excellent advice that had been given.

The general East Texas State University experience judgment was *strong*, 4.09, indicating a considerable satisfaction. No difference was found between the ratings of former and present students. The positive comments praised the availability of professors for conferences, the quality of that advice, and that the University takes an interest in, cares about, students. Five also made specific reference to the bilingual program staff as very helpful to students. Two noted that they had attended other universities and that the East Texas State University experience was the most rewarding of any. Only two negative context comments were included: some professors are prejudiced against Mexican Americans, and that in some curriculum courses, there is too much busy work and not enough content. The preponderance of commendations for the University experience was a strong feature for the University and for the Title VII project.

The survey form was designed to be folded and mailed, free of charge, back to the program office. That procedure left one third of the back without items for the respondents. Nevertheless, 21 (42%) utilized the space to add other comments. Some of these were reiterations of what had been said about the courses or the program: high praise for the graduate Spanish course and professor, accessibility of the professors and program staff, and special commendations for some other professors. Seven comments assessed the use of Spanish in the methods courses as very important to becoming truly bilingual; one noted her acquisition of professional vocabulary from that component.

Five participants utilized the space to make suggestions about the survey instrument. Four noted that some of the course groupings encompassed many courses in many departments, taught by many professors, and that the variation among them made it difficult to arrive at a rating. Social studies was given as an example in which one participant stated he would have rated some specific courses *very weak* and others *very strong*, thus he had to settle on a *fair* rating, which thus masked the reality of the situation. No doubt others experienced the same difficulty even though they did not express it as directly.

Four former students utilized the space to compliment the Title VII Bilingual Studies program for conducting the survey. All four noted they had studied at other institutions and had never been asked to make judgments about them. They felt the survey was an indication of the project and University concern for its students. Each also expressed an interest in knowing about the results; since the surveys were anonymous, communicating directly with them is not possible. An announcement about where and when interested persons might view the results would be appropriate.

REPORT SUMMARY

The 1982-1983 report on the external evaluation of the East Texas State University ESEA Title VII Bilingual Program comprises two distinct sections:

1. the annual external evaluation;
2. a survey of present and former participants.

The major portion of this document is devoted to the annual evaluation but that does not diminish the importance of the participant survey, which although provisional pending the receipt of more survey forms, adds a valuable element via a followup to former students.

Summary of the 1982-1983 Evaluation

The 1982-1983 ESEA Title VII Bilingual Program at East Texas State University, as in most past years, operated on funds from the University, the US Department of Education, and some special monies for specific courses from the Texas Education Agency. The increased emphasis on the undergraduate level, begun last year, was continued but many masters, some specialist and doctoral participants were included.

The program's goals sought the enhancement of learing and educational opportunities for all children; they specifically were aimed at those with limited English proficiency. The means to those ends were the preparation of high quality bilingual and ESL teachers, specialists in those subjects and the support fields, and administrators capable of managing such programs. Measurable objectives were stated for the project and this external evaluation, together with the reports from internal monitoring, were designed to assure the appropriate provision of the services to the participants. It was expected that success in the project's objectives would aid in improved learning by the University students and then transmitted into better teaching of the children in the service area, that of North Texas, and thus contribute to progress across the nation.

The evaluation was comprised of both formative and summative aspects to furnish immediate feedback to the administration while modifications could still be effected, and subsequently, an overall assessment of the conduct and the results of the project's year. Document reviews, interviews, observations, questionnaires, and opinionnaires were the principal methods utilized to obtain the data. Activities on the Commerce campus and at the Satellite Learning Center in the Dallas area were monitored twice during the year by the external evaluator.

The project began in cooperation with the Dallas schools but since progressed to ten others. Cooperation with other universities, with education service centers, and dissemination and assessment centers was active. Unusually strong interactions were chronicled with the Texas Education Agency. Internally, the project works well with the departments and colleges; a campus wide committee is active in advising the direction of the activities. Major changes among the University administrative personnel did not diminish the thrust or acceptance of the program.

Courses are offered in several settings for the convenience of the students and to enhance the practicality of the offerings: the home campus, the Satellite Learning Center, and in cooperating school districts. The main campus library

has an impressive holding of bilingual and related subject materials for study; the Satellite Learning Center has many of the most used materials. Professors transport large amounts of materials with them when they teach in other sites, thus facilitating the study of the participants in those places. The administration was consolidated into a single position this year, and although it places a heavy burden on that professor, the work was accomplished effectively.

East Texas State University demonstrated its continuing commitment to the project through furnishing the salaries of most of the professors, part of that of the administrator, and providing adequate office space. All of the professors but one were on permanent status and that one was promoted this year; all aspects of institutionalization were unusually strong. The faculty and students both demonstrated increased professionalization efforts during the year, again a continuation of their strong showing previously.

The major component of the project, the instruction of the students, was rated high by the observor and by the participants. Only a few courses were still posing problems and that number decreased from last year and was comprised entirely of undergraduate offerings. Graduate courses generally, Spanish, and methods courses enjoyed the highest ratings. It was notable that the number of elements in the courses that was judged weak diminished to only a half dozen replies. The instruction was a very positive part of the Title VII project services.

The degree and endorsement/certificate plans and processes were also judged in the strong category by the respondents. This did not differ between graduate and undergraduate students. Advising was praised as having improved during the year, reflecting favorably on the director and the staff that assists with that phase of the work.

When the 1982-1983 results were compared with previous years, two kinds of findings were evident. The improvements in the courses registered last year continued strong. These have enjoyed increased ratings since the beginning and now are very positive. The degree design also has improved substantially from the earliest years, 1976 and 1977. The degree program was still being modified at that time, and changes are still being included, and apparently those have been salutory in the eyes of the students.

Summary of the Followup Survey

The East Texas State University bilingual project, not content with its annual evaluations, decided to begin a followup survey of former participants this year. First, direct contacts were made with as many as possible, verifying addresses and current occupations. Second, during the summer a survey form was mailed to them. The information sought was similar to that of the annual evaluations but summarized the items into more general categories. The report is, at this time, provisional since little time has elapsed for the returns. Nevertheless, fifty had replied and an examination of them showed good representation for the most recent five years but some weakness previous to that time, probably due to changes of residence.

The judgments about the following course groupings was strong or higher: Spanish, bilingual methods, ESL methods, and social studies/multicultural methods. Former students differed from present students only in that they accorded an even higher rating for the graduate Spanish classes. Comments on the ratings were requested and almost all of them were positive; they few with negative content were couched

in terms of suggestions for improvement. A few voiced substantive complaints about specific courses or professors; these were the same as had been registered across the years.

The degree process was accorded a strong rating; most of the comments praised the advising. The endorsement/certificate process was given a slightly lower rating, with the respondents almost equally divided among fair, strong, and very strong judgments. Very few comments were supplied and those primarily dealt with transfer problems to and from other universities in the Federation.

A final item probed judgments about the overall East Texas State University experience. That, too, was assigned a strong rating. Many comments were written on this item, chiefly dealing with the interest in, and caring about, the students on the campus. Many included the project specifically in those favorable replies.

A space had intentionally been left blank on the form to protect the replies from inspection by others during the mailing. Many students used that space to reinforce what had been said previously with the majority reiterating praise for the graduate Spanish courses and the professor. Some other professors and the advising also drew repeated favorable accounts. Four students that had attended other institutions lauded the followup survey effort, noting it as continued evidence of East Texas State University and the ESEA Title VII Bilingual Program interest in students and the results of the project work.

APPENDICES

A: Revised Program of Studies

B: Annual Evaluation Form

C: Followup Survey Form

49 The previous numbered page in the original document was blank

Appendix A

REVISED PROGRAM OF STUDIES 1982-83

The courses below are approved for funding during 1982-83 and represent modifications aimed at meeting state endorsement requirements in Bilingual Education and English as a Second Language.

M.Ed. Core Program

Six Courses from: (These constitute the major)

El.Ed. 595 Research Literature and Techniques

El.Ed. 501 Language Acquisition and Development in Early Childhood

El.Ed. 502 Foundations in Communications Skills for Bilingual Students: Reading, Listening, Speaking and Writing

El.Ed. 503 Foundation Skills for Bilingual Teaching of Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies

El.Ed. 649 Teaching the Bilingual-Bicultural Child
or
El.Ed. 624 Children of Minority Cultures
or
El.Ed. 625 Teaching Children of Minority Cultures-Nursery through Primary

El.Ed. 524 Language ARts Curriculum for Grades One through Eight
or
RDG. 522 Reading in the Elementary School
or
RDG. 556 Developmental Reading
or
RDG. 525 Teaching Reading Comprehension

El.Ed. 529 Workshop in Elementary Education: English as a Second Language Methods and Materials

El.Ed. 529 Workshop in Elementary Education: Methods and Materials for Multicultural Awareness

BILINGUAL EDUCATION ENDORSEMENT

GRADUATE PROGRAM

I. Course requirements

12 semester hours:

ELED 501 - Language Acquisition and Development in Early Childhood

ELED 502 - Foundations in Communications Skills for Bilingual Students: Reading, Listening, Speaking and Writing

ELED 503 - Foundation Skills for Bilingual Teaching of Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies

FLL 511 - Teaching a Second Language

II. Other requirements

1. Bachelors's degree
2. Valid Texas teacher certificate
3. Oral proficiency: Language Proficiency Interview (LPI), Level 3
4. Written proficiency: College Level Examination Program (CLEP) - Score - 50
5. One year successful classroom teaching experience in an organized approved bilingual education program.

Interdisciplinary Program

Six Courses from: (These constitute minor or "other" courses)

FLL 512 Bilingual Program for Elementary Teachers

SPA 505 Children's Literature in Spanish

SPA 555 Studies in Literary Movements: Mexican American (Chicano) Literature

ENG 557 Teaching English as a Second Language

ENG 558 Sociolinguistics

ENG 555A General Linguistics

ENG 556 Comparative Linguistics

SOC/ANTH 553 American Subcultural Groups
or ANTH 547 Culture in Education

FLL 511 Teaching a Second Language

ENG 597 Special Topics in English: Psycholinguistics

FLL 515 Seminar on Cross-Cultural Aspects of Bilingualism

*SPA 502 Survival Spanish for School Personnel

*SPA 503 Practical Spanish for Bilingual Situations

*SPA 504 Advanced Spanish for Bilingual Situations

*Any or all of these may be funded, but only one can be counted toward the Master's Degree in Elementary Education

EAST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY BILINGUAL TRAINING PROGRAM

Instructional Evaluation

Undergraduate__, Masters__, Post Masters__, Doctoral__

1. Present Occupation:

__Teacher, grades 1-3 __Administrator __Other, please specify:

__Teacher, grades 4-6 __Aide _____

__Teacher, grades 7-12 __Student

2. Total Teaching Experience:

__None __3-5 years

__Less than 9 mo. __6-10 years

__1-2 years __11 or more

3. Total Bilingual eaching Experience:

__None __3-5 years

__Less than 9 mo. __6-10 years

__1-2 years __11 or more

4. Male__Female__

5. Ethnicity: Mexican American__, Black__, Anglo__, Other (specify):_____

6. Do you have the bilingual education endorsement? Yes__, No__

7. If yes, was the endorsement obtained through: ETSU__, district__, other university__

8. __ I am receiving Title VII funding for this program.

__ I am paying my own fees.

__ I am receiving other than Title VII funding.

WHAT SUGGESTIONS DO YOU HAVE FOR IMPROVING THE FOLLOWING? (Use back if needed.)

1. Language program

2. Culture program

3. Teaching methodologies

4. Research

5. Looking at your degree program as a whole, and from what you can tell at this point, how would you rate it?

__very weak, __weak, __fair, __strong, __very strong

...continued...

6. How would you rate your fluency in Spanish at this point in the program?

__very fluent, __fairly fluent, __know some Spanish, __know nearly no Spanish

How would you rate your writing in Spanish?

__very fluent, __fairly fluent, __can write some, __can write very little.

7. How would you rate the effectiveness of the liaison program (school visits) in helping you?

__very effective, __fairly effective, __not effective, __not observed

PLEASE CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER TO INDICATE YOUR RATING FOR EACH OF THE COMPONENTS OF EACH OF YOUR COURSES (please request a separate sheet for each):

	1 very strong	2 strong	3 fair	4 weak	5 very weak
1. How would you rate the coverage of the subject matter?	1	2	3	4	5
2. How would you rate the methods used in teaching the course?	1	2	3	4	5
3. How closely were the tests related to the materials covered?	1	2	3	4	5
4. In so far as you can tell at this point, how would you rate the grading system used in this course?	1	2	3	4	5
5. How would you rate your learning in this course?	1	2	3	4	5
6. Taking all factors into consideration, what would your rating be for this course?	1	2	3	4	5

Course/Dept._____Number_____Section____

Social Security Number (optional)_____

Appendix C

ETSU STUDENT SURVEY

The East Texas State University Bilingual Studies program is conducting this followup survey to obtain information about its academic program and how it can be improved. We would appreciate your replies to these few questions as a part of that effort. Please feel free to add any suggestions that will help the program.

Thank you. Dr. Alonzo Sosa, Coordinator *A. H. Sosa*

GENERAL INFORMATION:

1.a. I am currently taking one or more courses at ETSU. Yes__ No__
b. I am currently taking one or more courses at another university. Yes__ No__

2.a. What is your current occupation? Teacher: Elementary__ Secondary__; Administrator (specify): _____ Other (specify): _____
b. If you are not a teacher now, did you teach after leaving ETSU? Yes__ No__
c. If you taught, did you teach in a bilingual program? Yes__ No__
d. Did you teach ESL or a similar program? Yes__ No__

3. Academic training achiever:

a. Bachelors degree: Yes__ No__ (b) If yes, at ETSU:__ or another university?__
c. Masters degree: Yes__ No__; (d) If yes, at ETSU?__ or another university?__
e. Doctoral degree: Yes__ No__; (f) If yes, at ETSU?__ or another university?__
g. I only took a few courses at ETSU rather than a degree or certificate program ✓

4. a. Do you hold the bilingual endorsement? Yes__ No__;
b. Did you qualify for it at ETSU? ___ or at another institution? ___
c. If you obtained any other certificate or endorsement from ETSU, please list it (them): _____

EVALUATION INFORMATION:

Please answer the following questions by circling a number on the scale that best describes your judgement about the program components listed: 1-very weak, 2=weak, 3=fair, 4=strong, 5=very strong, 6=didnot participate/don't know/does not apply. Please use the comment line for exceptions or other special ideas you want to communicate.

5. a. Spanish course(s) 1 2 3 4 5 6
b. Comment _____
6. a. English course(s) 1 2 3 4 5 6
b. Comment _____
7. a. Social studies/history course(s) 1 2 3 4 5 6
b. Comment _____
8. a. Math/science course(s) 1 2 3 4 5 6
b. Comment _____
9. a. Bilingual methods course(s) 1 2 3 4 5 6
b. Comment _____
10. a. Other language arts methods course(s) 1 2 3 4 5 6
b. Comment _____
11. a. ESL methods course(s) 1 2 3 4 5 6
b. Comment _____
12. a. Social studies/multicultural methods course(s) 1 2 3 4 5 6
b. Comment _____

13.a. Course (s) on methods for other subjects 1 2 3 4 5 6

b. Comment_____

14.a. Your endorsement/certificate program as a whole 1 2 3 4 5 6

b. Comment_____

15.a. Your degree program as a whole 1 2 3 4 5 6

b. Comment_____

16.a. Thinking about your ETSU program as a whole, including advising, academics, and assistance, please give an overall rating. 1 2 3 4 5 6

b. Comment_____

_____

_____

Please fold so that the portion above is inside - covered up. Thank you for your help.

Fold here, please, so that the portion below is outside; staple or tape the edge, and mail.

Prepaid Postage

Office of Bilingual Studies
East Texas State University
Commerce, Texas 75428